

REMARKS

In the September 22, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-6, 14-19, 25-31 and 37-53 were pending in the application; and rejected all of the claims under the second paragraph of 35 USC § 112. The reason given was "insufficient antecedent basis for ... [the] limitation" (Office Action page 2, last two lines) recited on lines 14-20 of claim 1 and the similar limitations recited in the other independent claims. In a telephone conversation on December 7, 2005, the Examiner clarified that this "insufficient antecedent basis" was not a lack of antecedent basis in the claims, as usual in such rejections, but rather was a lack of support in the specification.

In response to this rejection as clarified on December 7, the independent claims have been amended to recite what is displayed under what conditions as described at, e.g., page 14, lines 1-5; page 20, line 11 to page 21, line 12; page 24, lines 1-11; page 26, line 27 to page 29, line 4 and page 30, lines 7-19. Specifically, when an image is previously stored, the system #obtains "the display position information from said first storing section and displaying the part of the original image located at the location indicated by the display position information at the image magnification ratio on said display screen" (e.g., claim 1, last three lines). If the image is not previously stored, the image is displayed "at the image magnification ratio, which has been calculated by said arithmetic section" (e.g., claim 1, lines 18-20).

In the Advisory Action mailed January 9, 2006, it was indicated that the Amendment filed December 22, 2005 was not entered because the amendments allegedly "raise the issue of new matter" because the Examiner did not find the amendments to be consistent with the specification. The only portion of the specification cited by the Examiner as inconsistent with the claims was page 5 because it "does not reveal a confirmation process as claimed" (Advisory Action, page 2, lines 1-2).

First, it is noted that page 5 of the specification was not cited as supporting the amendments made to the claims in either the December 22, 2005 Amendment or above. The Examiner is respectfully requested to consider the portions of the specification cited in support of the amendments, instead of a different portion of the specification which might describe something different.

As described in the portions of the specification cited for support of the amendments, the invention displays "an index image, [at] the position ... associated with an original image" (page 14, lines 1-3). The more detailed description on pages 20-21 describes what display control section 7 (Fig. 1) does when the display image is stored and when it is not stored in the image

information storing section 5a. To be able to take different actions, it is inherent that the display control section must determine (or confirm) whether "part of the original image is stored" (claim 1, line 16). As described at the bottom of page 20, when no image is stored, the display control section "makes the image processing section 8a (arithmetic section 14a) calculate an enlargement ratio or reduction ratio (referred to as a 'magnification ratio') for generating the display image" (page 20, lines 24-27). This is consistent with what is recited on lines 19-20 of claim 1. The operations performed when the image is stored in image information storing section 5a are described at the top of page 21, including that "the image at the coordinate position stored in the 'display position' can be displayed on the display device 11" (page 21, lines 11-12). The detailed description of how the image is displayed at the "magnification ratio" is provided from the bottom of page 26 to the top of page 29. The entire process is summarized on page 30, lines 7-19.

Claim 3 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1 and the amendments made to the other independent claims are similarly consistent with the above-cited portions of the specification. Therefore, it is submitted that the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 USC § 112 was improper.

Entry of Amendment

It is submitted that the claims as amended are fully supported by the specification. Since these amendments will reduce the number of issues on appeal, entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested. Since no other rejections were made, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-18 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 09/826,914

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2/22/06

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501